

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MARYLAND**

Federal Trade Commission

Plaintiff,

v.

Innovative Marketing, Inc., *et al.*

Defendants,

AND

Maurice D’Souza

Relief Defendant.

CIVIL NO. RDB 08-CV-3233

**JOINT MOTION FOR STAY OF FURTHER PROCEEDINGS
AS TO JAMES M. RENO AND BYTEHOSTING INTERNET SERVICES, LLC
PENDING APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT**

Plaintiff, the Federal Trade Commission (“FTC” or “Commission”), and Defendants James M. Reno and Bytehosting Internet Services, LLC (“Bytehosting”), hereby request that the Court stay further proceedings in this action as to James M. Reno and Bytehosting only for a period of ninety (90) days. The parties jointly stipulate and respectfully request a stay of all proceedings as to James M. Reno and Bytehosting only so that the Commission’s attorneys can seek the Commission’s approval of a Stipulated Final Order For Permanent Injunction and Monetary Judgment As To Defendants James M. Reno and Bytehosting Internet Services, LLC (“Proposed Stipulated Final Order”). In support of this motion, the parties state the following:

Procedural Background

1. On December 2, 2008, the FTC filed its Complaint for Permanent Injunction and Other Equitable Relief (hereinafter, the “Complaint”) alleging that the Defendants violated Section

- 5(a) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. §45(a). The Complaint requests that the Court enter preliminary and permanent injunctive relief and award monetary relief in the form of, *inter alia*, consumer redress and/or disgorgement of ill-gotten gains. The FTC concurrently filed a request for an *ex parte* Temporary Restraining Order which the Court granted that same day.
2. On December 12, 2008, the Court held an uncontested preliminary injunction hearing and entered a preliminary injunction as to all of the defendants.

Settlement of this Action

3. On March 11, 2009, James M. Reno and Bytehosting executed a Proposed Stipulated Final Order.
4. The FTC is an independent federal agency. Therefore, all settlements negotiated by counsel and signed by defendants must be approved by the Director of the Bureau of Consumer Protection and then considered, voted on, and approved by the full Commission. The Commission's consideration of the Proposed Stipulated Final Order could take up to ninety (90) days. Assuming approval is granted, Plaintiff will execute and submit the Proposed Stipulated Final Order to the Court for approval.
3. If the Commission approves the Proposed Stipulated Final Order, further proceedings in this case as to James M. Reno and Bytehosting will be unnecessary. Accordingly, a stay of further proceedings as to James M. Reno and Bytehosting only would serve the interest of judicial economy and conserve the parties' resources.

WHEREFORE, the parties respectfully request the Court stay further proceedings in this action as to James M. Reno and Bytehosting only for a period of ninety (90) days.

Dated: March 17, 2009

Respectfully submitted:

/s/ Colleen B. Robbins

Dated: March 17, 2009

Ethan Arenson
Colleen B. Robbins
Federal Trade Commission
600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20580
(202) 326-2204; (202) 326-2548; (202) 326-3643

Attorneys for Plaintiff Federal Trade Commission

/s/ Erik W. Laursen

Dated: March 17, 2009

Christian A. Jenkins
Erik W. Laursen
Minnillo & Jenkins
22 W 9th Street
Cincinnati, OH 45202
(513) 723-1600

**Attorney for Defendants James M. Reno and
ByteHosting Internet Services, LLC**

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MARYLAND**

Federal Trade Commission

Plaintiff,

v.

Innovative Marketing, Inc., *et al.*

Defendants,

AND

Maurice D'Souza

Relief Defendant.

CIVIL NO. RDB 08-CV-3233

**ORDER GRANTING JOINT MOTION FOR STAY OF FURTHER PROCEEDINGS
AS TO JAMES M. RENO AND BYTEHOSTING INTERNET SERVICES, LLC
PENDING APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT**

Upon consideration of the parties' Joint Motion for Stay of Further Proceedings As To James M. Reno and Bytehosting Internet Services, LLC Pending Approval of Settlement, and finding good cause exists, it is this ____ day of _____, 2009, hereby:

ORDERED that all proceedings in this action as to James M. Reno and Bytehosting Internet Services, LLC are stayed for ninety (90) days.

IS IT SO ORDERED THIS ____ OF MARCH, 2009:

Richard D. Bennett
United States District Judge

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MARYLAND**

Federal Trade Commission

Plaintiff,

v.

Innovative Marketing, Inc., et al.

Defendants,

AND

Maurice D'Souza

Relief Defendant.

CIVIL NO. RDB 08-CV-3233

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on March 17, 2009, I caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing to be served via the Court's electronic filing system upon:

Tom Kirsch
Winston & Strawn
35 W. Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois
60601-9703
Counsel for Kristy Ross

Robert Luskin
Patton Boggs LLP
2550 M Street, NW
Washington, DC 20037
Counsel for Sam Jain

Garret Rasmussen
Orrick
Columbia Center
1152 15th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-1706
Counsel for Marc D'Souza and Maurice D'Souza

Christian A. Jenkins
Erik W. Laursen
Minnillow & Jenkins
22 West 9th Street
Cincinnati, OH 45202
Counsel for James Reno and ByteHosting Internet Services LLC

/s/ Colleen B. Robbins